

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. Claim 5 is canceled. Claim 30 is added. Support for claim 30 can be found in the specification on page 17, line 19 through page 18, line 7. Claims 1, 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27 are amended. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification on page 9, lines 9-11. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18, 20-27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Nakano et al.*, System and Method For Website Development, U.S. Patent No. 6,792,454, (hereinafter “*Nakano*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner states:

Referring to claim 1,

Nakano teaches a method in a data processing system for managing access (col. 2, line 28-33, “Additionally, it is desirable to have a web development system that allows contributors to access an earlier version of a file, website subsection, or website and that allows a webmaster to check on the progress of contributors, as well as more easily post changes to a website.”) to a set of applications (col. 5, line 24-39, col. 21, line 13-20, “Each area appears to be a complete website at the HTTP protocol level. To accomplish this without having a separate web server for each area, virtualization module 137 enables a single web server to appear as multiple web servers. This greatly reduces deployment and maintenance costs while allowing each area to be a complete website at the HTTP protocol level.”) associated with a universal resource locator (col. 23, line 30-37, “FIGS. 36a-b illustrate the operation of virtualization module 137 for handling absolute and relative requests. The virtualization module 137 receives 3610 an HTTP request from a web browser on one of the development workstations 110, and extracts 3620 the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address from the request. The virtualization module 137 also extracts 3630 the cookie that has been sent with the URL address.”), the method comprising:

receiving a request for a first application from a second application (col. 23, line 30-37, “FIGS. 36a-b illustrate the operation of virtualization module 137 for handling absolute and relative requests. The virtualization module 137 receives 3610 an HTTP request from a web browser on one of the development workstations 110, and extracts 3620 the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address from the request. The virtualization module 137 also extracts 3630 the cookie that has been sent with the URL address.” Note: Second application is requested URL and first application is the browser from which URL is requested.), wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification (col. 23, line 30-37, “The virtualization module 137 also extracts 3630 the cookie that has been sent with the URL address.”);

modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application (col. 23, line 52-59, “If the request is an absolute request, the virtualization module 137 searches 3650 the mapping rules corresponding to the branch along which the viewing area resides and

selects 3660 the appropriate prefix (either a document root prefix or a special prefix based on the mapping rules (as discussed above)). The virtualization module 137 attaches 3670 the selected prefix to the original request or a part thereof in accordance with the appropriate mapping rule.”); and

directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the modified universal resource locator (col. 21, line 20-col.22, line 67).

Office Action dated September 13, 2007, pages 9-11.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In this case each and every feature of the presently claimed invention is not identically shown in the cited reference, arranged as they are in the claims. Amended claim 1 is as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system for managing access to a set of applications associated with a universal resource locator, the method comprising:
receiving a request for a first application from a second application,
wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification and, wherein every request for applications within the set of applications uses the universal resource locator;
modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification,
wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application; and
directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the modified universal resource locator.

Nakano does not anticipate amended claim 1 because *Nakano* does not teach each and every feature of amended claim 1. For example, *Nakano* does not teach the amended feature of, “wherein every request for applications within the set of applications uses the universal resource locator,” as recited in amended claim 1. *Nakano* teaches a file management system for managing different versions of a file. (*Nakano*, Abstract) *Nakano* teaches three file systems, called areas, for storing files associated with different completeness levels. *Id.* Files in the work area are modifiable; files in the staging area are read-only; and files in the edition area are also read only. *Id.* *Nakano* utilizes a virtualization module to alter the directory path of the request so that the directory path corresponds to the area from which the request originated (*Nakano*, col. 21, lines 26-29).

However, *Nakano* does not teach the amended feature of, “wherein every request for applications within the set of applications uses the universal resource locator,” as recited in amended claim 1. *Nakano*

teaches receiving different universal resource locator requests for different files. *Nakano* states, “After processing an HTTP request, the virtualization module 137 forwards the HTTP request to the web server 145, which retrieves the requested document from the location specified by the request,” (*Nakano*, col. 21, lines 34-37). *Nakano* teaches that the requests specify the location. Thus, the requests, as taught by *Nakano*, are not all the same. For example, *Nakano* states, “If the original URL request is GET /documents/index.html, the document root prefix will be appended directly in front of the first “/” of the original request,” (*Nakano*, col. 22, lines 25) and, “If the original request is GET /special/index.html, the prefix “/Foo” is added to “/index.html,”” (*Nakano*, col. 22, lines 44-45). *Nakano* clearly teaches, as shown in the preceding example, that the requests for accessing the files utilize different universal resource locators. Accordingly, *Nakano* does not teach the amended feature of, “wherein every request for applications within the set of applications uses the universal resource locator,” as recited in amended claim 1.

In addition, *Nakano* does not teach the feature of, “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application,” as recited in amended claim 1. The Examiner cites to the following portion of *Nakano* in asserting otherwise:

If the request is an absolute request, the virtualization module 137 searches 3650 the mapping rules corresponding to the branch along which the viewing area resides and selects 3660 the appropriate prefix (either a document root prefix or a special prefix based on the mapping rules (as discussed above)). The virtualization module 137 attaches 3670 the selected prefix to the original request or a part thereof in accordance with the appropriate mapping rule.

Nakano, col. 23, lines 52-59.

The above cited portion of *Nakano* teaches modifying an absolute request by appending the appropriate prefix to the original request. The appropriate prefix is determined by a mapping rule. However, neither the above portion nor any other portion of *Nakano* teaches that the universal resource locator is unchanged as shown in the second application. The above portion of *Nakano* is devoid of any teaching stating that the universal resource locator is unchanged as shown in the second application. In addition, the remaining disclosure of *Nakano* is devoid of any teachings in regards to maintaining the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application. Therefore, *Nakano* does not teach the above recited feature of claim 1.

For at least the reasons presented above, *Nakano* does not teach each and every feature of amended claim 1. Therefore, *Nakano* does not anticipate amended claim 1. In addition, because amended claims 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27 recite similar features as those presented in claim 1, the

same distinctions between *Nakano* vis-à-vis claim 1 apply to claims 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27. Accordingly, *Nakano* also does not anticipate claims 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27.

Nakano also does not anticipate new claim 30. Claim 30 is recited below:

30. The method of claim 1, wherein directing the request to the selected application within the set of applications using the modified universal resource locator comprises:
writing the modified universal resource locator in a source code of the selected application to form a modified source code;
compiling the modified source code of the selected application to form a modified selected application; and
directing the request to the modified selected application in place of the selected application.

Nakano does not teach each and every feature recited in claim 30. For example, *Nakano* does not teach the features of, “writing the modified universal resource locator in a source code of the selected application to form a modified source code” and “compiling the modified source code of the selected application to form a modified selected application,” as recited in claim 30. *Nakano* is devoid of any disclosure referencing writing and compiling the modified universal resource locator in a source code of the selected application. Accordingly, *Nakano* also does not anticipate claim 30.

Because 3-6, 9, 14-17, 20, 22-26, and 29 depend from amended claims 1, 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27, respectively, *Nakano* also does not anticipate the remaining set of claims. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18, 20-27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejects claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over *Nakano* in view of *Levergood et al., Internet Server Access Control and Monitoring Systems*, U.S. Publication 2006/0095526, (hereinafter “*Levergood*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Additionally, all limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Therefore, no *prima facie* obviousness rejection can be established if the proposed combination does not teach all of the features of the claimed invention. Furthermore, if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

No *prima facie* obviousness rejection can be stated against claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28 because the combination of references, considered as a whole, fails to teach or suggest all of the features of amended claims 1, 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27 from which claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28 depend. Specifically, the proposed combination of references, considered as a whole, does not teach or suggest the features of, “wherein every request for applications within the set of applications uses the universal resource locator” and “modifying the universal resource locator based on the user identification, wherein the step of modifying maintains the universal resource locator unchanged as shown in the second application,” as recited in amended claim 1

Levergood teaches methods for controlling and monitoring access to network servers. *Levergood* teaches forwarding a service request (URL) from the client to the server and appending a session identification (SID) to the request and to subsequent service requests from the client to the server within a session of requests (*Levergood*, paragraph 0011, lines 6-10). However, *Levergood* does not teach and is unrelated to the above recited features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, *Levergood* does not teach or suggest the above recited features of amended claim 1.

Because neither reference, alone or in combination, teaches all of the features of amended claims 1, 7, 10-12, 18, 21, and 27 from which claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28 depend, the proposed combination of references, considered as a whole, fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28. Therefore, no *prima facie* obviousness rejection can be stated against claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2, 8, 13, 19 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III. Conclusion

The subject application is patentable over the cited references and should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 12/7/2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Nam H. Huynh/

Nam H. Huynh
Reg. No. 60,703
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants